

**THE MAJORIE FIRM LTD.****E-Filed: August 5, 2013**

Francis B. Majorie PC  
*Pro Hac Vice* (Per Bk Dkt. 1915 ¶ 153)  
 3514 Cedar Springs Road  
 Dallas, Texas 75219  
 Telephone: (214) 522-7400  
 Facsimile: (214) 522-7911

Attorneys for Donna Cangelosi, as TDI  
 Representative under an Order entered  
 by this Court on May 3, 2012

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

In re

ASSET RESOLUTION, LLC,

Debtor.

CASE NO. BK-S-09-32824-RCJ (Lead Case)

Jointly Administered with Case Nos.:

BK-S-09-32831-RCJ; BK-S-09-32839-RCJ;  
 BK-S-09-32843-RCJ; BK-S-09-32844-RCJ;  
 BK-S-09-32846-RCJ; BK-S-09-32849-RCJ;  
 BK-S-09-32851-RCJ; BK-S-09-32853-RCJ;  
 BK-S-09-32868-RCJ; BK-S-09-32873-RCJ;  
 BK-S-09-32875-RCJ; BK-S-09-32878-RCJ;  
 BK-S-09-32880-RCJ; BK-S-09-32882-RCJ

Chapter 7

## Affects:

- ☒ All Debtors  
☐ Asset Resolution, LLC, 09-32824  
☐ Bundy 2.5 Million SPE, LLC, 09-32831  
☐ Bundy Five Million SPE, LLC, 09-32839  
☐ CFP Anchor B SPE, LLC, 09-32843  
☐ CFP Cornman Toltec SPE, LLC, 09-32844  
☐ CFP Gess SPE LLC, 09-32846  
☐ CFP Gramercy SPE, LLC, 09-32849  
☐ Fiesta Stoneridge, LLC, 09-32851  
☐ Fox Hills SPE, LLC, 09-32853  
☐ HFAH Monaco SPE LLC, 09-32868  
☐ Huntsville SPE LLC, 09-32873  
☐ Lake Helen Partners SPE LLC, 09-32875  
☐ Ocean Atlantic SPE LLC, 09-32878  
☐ Shamrock SPE LLC, 09-32880  
☐ 10-90 SPE, LLC, 09-32882

**CANGELOSI'S REPLY TO MIDLAND  
 PACIFIC BUILDING CORPORATION'S  
 OPPOSITION TO CANGELOSI'S  
 MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Date: August 7, 2013

Time: 8:45 a.m.

Ctmm: RCJ - Courtroom 4B

Lloyd D. George Courthouse

333 Las Vegas Blvd. South

Las Vegas, NV 89101

Judge: Hon. Robert C. Jones

TDI Representative Donna Cangelosi ("Cangelosi") replies to the opposition (Doc. 2162)(the  
 "Midland Opposition") filed by Midland Pacific Building Corporation ("Midland") to Cangelosi's

1 motion for reconsideration (Doc. 2153)(the “Motion”) of the Court’s July 9, 2013 order lifting the  
 2 automatic stay and for other relief (Doc. 2125), as follows:

3 I.

4 **CANGELOSI IS NOT SEEKING TO RELITIGATE**  
 5 **THE TWO DISMISSED COMPLAINTS**

6 Midland’s Opposition asserts that Cangelosi’s Motion represents an effort to re-litigate the  
 7 issues raised by the two Complaints this Court dismissed without prejudice. That is incorrect. This  
 8 Court declined to exercise jurisdiction over the two Complaints because the direct lender’s slander of  
 9 title claim is “wholly dependent upon Defendants’ right to record the Lis Pendens” and this Court  
 10 “will not interpose itself between the Superior Court and the Court of Appeals of the State of  
 11 California” on that issue. Cangelosi does not ask to undermine that ruling in any way. In fact,  
 12 Cangelosi agrees with Midland that the stay should be conditionally lifted to accommodate that  
 13 ruling. The only issue left for the Court is to determine which conditions it should impose and why.

14 Issue has been drawn—and NOT ruled upon—with respect to those conditions. The motions  
 15 presently before the Court ask it to rule on whether Midland has waived the right to seek specific  
 16 performance and, if not, whether Midland should be permitted to pursue such a claim without  
 17 depositing the cash necessary to cure Midland’s monthly-payment defaults, to pay for the property if  
 18 Midland succeeds in its specific performance claim, and to protect the direct lenders from being left  
 19 with no sale of their collateral at all when the \$13.5 million plus cash buyer has moved on to other  
 20 properties due to the delays and Midland either loses its specific performance claim on the merits or  
 21 decides that it cannot or does not want to purchase the property.

22 A resolution of these issues and the balance of equities implicated here are at the core of a  
 23 section 362 motion. They do NOT require the Court to even consider—let alone rule upon—  
 24 whether or not the direct lenders’ slander of title claim has merit. **Indeed, the direct lenders are**  
 25 **simply asking this Court to follow its practice in Gramercy and Gess and require would-be**  
 26

1 purchasers of assets to prove their *bona fides* by showing that they have the money to  
 2 undertake the transaction they purport to be pursuing. Midland should be held to no less as it  
 3 asks this Court to conditionally lift the stay in its favor.

## 4 II.

### 5 THE COURT MUST MAKE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

6 Midland's Opposition also asserts that this Court is not required to issue findings of fact and  
 7 conclusions of law when ruling on the pending motion for relief from the automatic stay. *See* Doc.  
 8 2162 at 1/lines 13-15. Midland assertion is, quite simply, wrong. Contrary to Midland's assertion,  
 9 when ruling upon a "contested matter" such as a motion for relief from the automatic stay, a  
 10 bankruptcy court must make findings of fact, either orally on the record or in a written decision. *See*  
 11 FED. R. BANKR. P. 9014(c) (incorporating FED. R. BANKR. P. 7052, which in turn incorporates FED.  
 12 R. CIV. P. 52(a)). These findings must be sufficient to enable a reviewing court to determine the  
 13 factual basis for the court's ruling. *Vance v. Am. Hawaii Cruises, Inc.*, 789 F.2d 790, 792 (9th  
 14 Cir.1986). "[W]here such findings and conclusions are lacking, [a reviewing court] may vacate and  
 15 remand." *Mazzeo v. Lennard (In re Mazzeo)*, 167 F.3d 139, 142 (2d Cir. 1999) (citations omitted).

17 These principles apply with particular force in the lift stay context. Courts have identified  
 18 various factors relevant to determining whether to grant relief from the automatic stay to allow  
 19 pending litigation to continue in another forum, including a set of twelve nonexclusive factors  
 20 known as the "Curtis factors" or "Sonnax factors." *See Kronemyer v. American Contractors Indem.*  
 21 *Co. (In re Kronemyer)*, 405 B.R. 915, 921 (B.A.P. 9th Cir. 2009); *Sonnax v. Tricomponent Prod.*  
 22 *Corp. (In re Sonnox Indus., Inc.)*, 907 F.2d 1280, 1286 (2d Cir. 1995) (adopting "Curtis factors").  
 23 Where a bankruptcy court fails to "mention *Sonnax*, or any doctrinal framework, and it is unclear  
 24 whether that court considered any of the *Sonnax* factors," the reviewing court should vacate and  
 25 remand for further findings. *Mazzeo*, 167 F.3d at 143; *see also Sinatra v. Gucci (In re Gucci)*, 309  
 26 B.R. 679, 685 (S.D.N.Y. 2004) (vacating and remanding where, though the bankruptcy court's grant

1 of plaintiff's sought relief implicitly rejected defendant's defense of laches, that court did not discuss  
2 the defense or its elements); *B.N. Realty Assocs. v. Lichtenstein*, 238 B.R. 249, 253 (S.D.N.Y. 1999)  
3 (vacating and remanding because "[t]he issue of whether to lift the [automatic] stay requires a  
4 factual determination based on a number of factors which—according to the record of the  
5 proceedings below—was not undertaken"); *cf. In re Godt*, 282 B.R. 577, 584-585 (S.D.N.Y. 2002)  
6 (distinguishing the bankruptcy court's oral ruling from *Mazzeo* where "the Bankruptcy Court  
7 referred to the *Sonnax* factors and noted the relevant factors applicable to the motion"). Thus, the  
8 Court must enter findings and conclusions in writing or on the record to support its rulings on the  
9 issues raised by the parties' lift stay arguments.

### 11 III.

#### 12 THE PARTIES STIPULATED TO A HEARING

13 Midland's Opposition also asserts that that the Court does not need to hold a hearing. This  
14 argument is now moot. The argument also ignores the fact that Midland STIPULATED there would  
15 be a hearing on the lift stay issues. *See* Doc. 1921 ("By their signatures below, Midland and  
16 Cangelosi stipulate to the entry of an order extending the automatic stay *until the conclusion of the*  
17 *hearing on Midland's motion*")(bold added).

IV.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons and the reasons provide in her other papers and to be presented at the hearing, Cangelosi respectfully requests that the Court: (a) grant her motion to reconsider and vacate the July 9, 2103 Order; (b) lift the stay on the conditions requested by Cangelosi; and (c) grant Cangelosi and the direct lenders such other relief to which they prove entitled.

Dated: August 5, 2013

Dallas, Texas

**THE MAJORIE FIRM LTD.**

/s/ Francis B. Majorie

Francis B. Majorie

3514 Cedar Springs Road

Dallas, Texas 75225

Telephone: (214) 522-7400

Facsimile: (214) 522-7911

fbmajorie@themajoriefirm.com

Attorneys for Donna Cangelosi, as TDI  
Representative under an Order entered  
by this Court on May 3, 202